REMARKS

The Applicant submits this paper as a fully-responsive reply to the Final Official Action mailed by the Office on 12 August 2004 (hereinafter the "Final Action"). The Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal on 11 February 2005, and this instant paper is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The Applicant submits that this paper and the related RCE are timely filed on or before 11 June 2005, with a petition for a two-month extension of time to respond.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections stated in the Final Action.

Claims 1-10 and 12-27 are pending in this application.

§103 Rejections

Paragraph 5 of the Final Action stated a rejection of **Claims 1-10 and 12-27** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neibauer (The ABCs of WordPerfect 8, published in 1997) in view of US Patent No. 6,480,206 to Prinzing (hereinafter, "Prinzing"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 as indicated above to clarify further features of the electronic document editor. These revisions are believed fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, by the Applicant's

specification, at least by page 3, lines 1-10, and by page 42, lines 5-6 and lines 18-20 thereof.

For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended above, with redlines included:

"1.   (Currently Amended) In an electronic document editor, a highlight rendering services component comprising:

a highlight rendering services interface that provides one or more methods to enable an editor extension to control which ~~highlight a~~ section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen and to control a style of the highlight, the editor extension determining a visual aspect of the highlight without altering the electronic document and the highlight rendering services component determining non-visual functional aspects of the highlight."

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Neibauer nor Prinzing teach or suggest an editor extension that controls which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen, as recited in claim 1. Neibauer is an excerpt from a user manual for the WORDPERFECT® word processor. While the Office cites pages 89 and 90 of Neibauer for various aspects of highlighting text in a word processor, Neibauer neither teaches nor suggests an editor extension that controls which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen. Instead, Neibauer appears to assume that the user of the WORDPERFECT® word processor would control what portions of the text are highlighted, rather than

extension of the WORDPERFECT® word processor. On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Neibauer neither teaches nor suggests the features recited above in claim 1.

Turning to the secondary reference, Prinzing, the Applicants agree that Neibauer does not disclose a method in which the non-visual and visual aspects of the highlight are determined by separate extensions, as stated in Paragraph 5 of the Final Action. Thus, the Office cited Prinzing as a secondary reference, more particularly, column 2, line 55 through column 4, line 14 of Prinzing. While Prinzing may refer to various aspects of a method and apparatus for an extensible editor, the Applicant respectfully submits that Prinzing neither teaches nor suggests "an editor extension to control which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen", as recited in claim 1. Prinzing lists several example styles or formats, including character styles such as bold, underline, or italic, (Prinzing, column 4, lines 60-65) and also including paragraph styles such as indentation, margins, and spacing (Prinzing, column 4, lines 45-50). However, in Prinzing, it appears that the user specifies or controls which text elements of the document are viewed or displayed in these various styles or formats.

In contrast to Prinzing, the Applicant's claim 1 recites that the editor extension controls which section of an electronic document is highlighted on a screen, rather than the user. On at least this basis, the Applicant respectfully

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

12

090370.DOC

PAGE 15/17 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 4:11:02 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/10 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:509 323 8979 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

submits that Prinzing does not supply the teaching or suggestion missing from Neibauer to support a § 103 rejection of claim 1.

Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Neibauer and Prinzing, whether considered severally or in combination, do not support a § 103 rejection of claim 1 because they do not teach or suggest at least the above feature recited in claim 1. The Applicant thus requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections stated in Paragraph 5 of the Final Action. These comments apply equally to claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1.

Independent claims 10, 17, and 22 are amended to clarify further aspects of the computer readable medium, the method, and the electronic document editor, respectively. More particularly, these independent claims are amended to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1 above. Thus, the above comments directed to claim 1, and to Neibauer and Prinzing, apply equally to claims 10, 17, and 22, and all claims depending therefrom.

LEE & HAYES, PLLC   13   090370.DOC

PAGE 16/17 * RCVD AT 6/13/2005 4:11:02 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/10 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:509 323 8979 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of Claims 1-10 and 12-27 as stated in the Final Action. If personal discussion would advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 13 Jun 05

By: _____
Rocco L. Adornato
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256; x257

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

14

response in MSI 676 US.doc